process. This is an idea that has been suggested by the court. This is not part of the labor versus management fight, you know, of past days. This is the court saying we could improve our process. The rule now is that if two parties agree to the use of an independent medical examiner, the independent medical examiner's decision is binding. It is like a sudden death period in football or whatever, but that's it. Because it has an implication, nobody is agreeing to use IMEs. I mean like out of hundreds of cases, it has been done six times. And then the court has to get asked to appoint an IME, and the court says to itself, you know, if it didn't have this consequence, maybe the parties would voluntarily agree, we'd have less time doing this, we wouldn't have to disturb ourselves so much, the lawyers would get together, they'd work it out more, we'd be involved less, it would be a better use of resources. That was their thinking and I can understand their thinking perfectly. The difficulty is this. The language that is now in the law was a position that one of the parties adopted as a retreat from a previous position they had taken. In other words, they gave and they accepted less, and the less they accepted was this language in the bill. So it was a strategic point for them. It was part of...they got something and so they gave something and this is what they gave and this is what they accepted in its place. Now I've got to tell you, I bear some responsibility here because the court came to me just before the session, or maybe it was even after the session began, when we were in the bill introduction phase, and they said, you know, we are going to put this in, what do you think? And I said, well, it makes some sense but, gosh, at a minimum, you need to give notice to all the parties, let them know. And they did send notice and the bill got in, but, in fact, one of the parties, and it happens to be the State Chamber, would rather like the context of sitting down with the traditional players because it was their strategic position that the court wants to do away with, and talk to the other parties, identify the rationale, and have a chance to talk about the issue, rather than have it dictated from above. Now what I haven't heard from the State Chamber is we are unalterably opposed to this concept. What I have heard is we'd like to establish the prospect of talking, not just to the court, but to labor, to the trial attorneys, to the insurance guys, if one of the provisions of 757 gets disturbed. Not saying yes, and not saying no, but shouldn't we talk to each other face to face